

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
ANDRE BISASOR, Plaintiff,

v.

CRAIG S. DONAIS; RUSSELL F. HILLIARD; DONAIS LAW OFFICES, PLLC;
UPTON & HATFIELD, LLP; and MARY K. DONAIS, Defendants.

Case No.1:23-cv-00374-JL

PLAINTIFF'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO CLARIFY HEARING

1. I the plaintiff ask the court for clarification on the following:
 - a. I would like to know what is the on court's mind to discuss in tomorrow's hearing on 4-23-24 i.e. the reason the court scheduled a hearing.
 - i. Because this is a status conference, I assume that this has more to do with scheduling issues and/or case management issues including certain procedural issues, etc. If so, I would like to be prepared as much as possible as I have little time to prepare as a pro se plaintiff. I would like a confirmation of this.
 - ii. Also, at this point, I am not prepared to engage in substantive arguments for any pending substantive motions dealing with the merits of the case or any dispositive matters. If the court intends to get into substantive merits for this case or dispositive matters, I need to have proper notice and adequate time to prepare.
 - iii. So, the bottom line is that if there is a particular agenda for the hearing (of what the court would like discuss at hearing), then I would like to know.
 - iv. NB: I asked the clerk about this but the clerk said 'there was no agenda'. I am not sure what this means as the court must have had some reason for calling the hearing.
 - v. I also have some items that I would like to discuss and I want to ensure that I can do so, including some items that might need to be sealed. How will the court handles confidential issues that may arise in the hearing? NB: I do not intend to divulge confidential or sealed information to the public or to the defendants.
 - b. How much time is allotted for the hearing.

- i. I asked the clerk staff about this and I was told that “the hearing will last as long as needed”. I am unclear what that means.
 - ii. I want to ensure that I have enough time to speak given that there are 5 defendants and likely 3 defendant attorneys that will appear tomorrow. I also understand that another non-party will be attending the zoom hearing tomorrow. Which also leads to my 3rd point below.
- c. I notice that Mark Cornell of the NH state ADO office is copied on the email invitation to the zoom hearing tomorrow.
 - i. I asked the clerk staff if this was an error or was there a reason why the ADO is being included in this hearing. The clerk staff stated that Mark Cornell “requested access” to the case.
 - ii. I have reached out to Mark Cornell and the ADO multiple times today about this, since this morning and I have not received any response at all even not by the end of the day today. This raises significant concerns. I am simply trying to understand what is going on and why Mark Cornell is seeking access to the hearing in this case. Can the court please inform me of the reason provided by Mr. Cornell for seeking such access to the hearing tomorrow?
 - iii. Also, I had asked the clerk staff a question earlier about whether the request for access by Mark Cornell was made to the judge or if it was granted by the judge. But the clerk staff has not yet answered that question. This is also concerning. If the court or the judge has received an ex parte request from an external party for access to the hearing tomorrow and that external party offered reasons for such access, then I would like to know the basis for the request and the basis for the court granting such request. I believe I am entitled to ex parte communications that have influenced the court, to include another party into the zoom hearing tomorrow.

- iv. NB: It is highly unusual for a government official to be seeking access to a hearing in a case that has nothing to do with that official or the government.
- v. Also, will Mr. Mark Cornell be allowed to participate and speak in the hearing?
- vi. NB: I asked the clerk about this and she said no, but I would like to bring this to the court's attention so that the court can clarify its intention regarding allowing Mr. Cornell to attend. I am further concerned that Mark Cornell and/or the ADO might be coordinating with defendants in this case behind the case, in order to possibly try to prejudice me in this civil case. Why else would Mark be trying to get access to this hearing? or why else would he even know about this hearing, other than the defendants in this case informing him of such?
- vii. I understand that the hearing is a public hearing. But Mark Cornell is a government party. He is not simply a member of the public. I am also concerned that by virtue of his position as a government party, he may seek to speak in the hearing or may asked by the defendants to speak, or the court may invite him to speak, and I would have no notice of what he intends to speak on or what her would say or why he would seek to speak on this hearing. I feel very uncomfortable with all of this. I do not want to be left in the dark or to be blindsided or surprised or set up or prejudice. I am not inclined to engage in blind trust of government and especially do not trust things that happen behind closed doors or where there is an intent to keep me in the dark as to what is going on, as indicated by the lack of response from Mark Cornell about any of this today.

- 2. Given the urgent circumstances and the unfolding of the circumstances today, I was not able to seek **concurrence from the defendants** before filing this emergency motion.
- 3. Please rule on this motion as soon as possible before the hearing tomorrow.
- 4. Please grant a pro se liberal construction to this pleading.
- 5. Please grant the relief requested or other relief deemed just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Andre Bisasor
Andre Bisasor

April 22, 2024

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was served to the defendants in this case.

/s/ Andre Bisasor
Andre Bisasor